

Koenig  
09/823,300

6

#### REMARKS

The undersigned acknowledges the courteous treatment extended to Mr. Belkin during the course of a personal interview held with the Examiner on June 16, 2006. The following summarizes the substance of the arguments presented by Mr. Belkin.

Claims 7,10-23,16-17 and 19-34 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lebby (6,158,884) in view of Japanese patent publication number 11-095318 of Ryuji.

Lebby discloses a wrist watch with communication capabilities and includes a display screen 27 which slides out from inside a housing. Other embodiments, illustrated in Figs. 4-6, show a plurality of screens in different configurations, all of which involve pivoting of the screens. Only in Fig. 1A is shown a screen 17 which slides in and out of the housing. When screen 17 is deployed, it is next to a conventional watch face (see col. 3, lines 10-11). There is no teaching or suggestion of multiple screens which when deployed form a continuous screen, nor any nesting of such screens.

The Japanese reference Ryuji is cited for this deficiency. The relevance of this patent is not understood. In the discussion within this reference, it is explained (as best understood) that when assembling big projection screens weighing of the order of 40 to 50 kg (ie, 88 to 110 lbs.), the purpose of the invention is to reduce "the number of erectors" required to assemble such screens (see Effect of the Invention). The exact words used in the patent are "the upper display unit enabling it to move free [sliding] on the top face of a lower display unit at the time of the assembly of a multiscreen display, even when a display unit is heavy, it will come to be assembled easily, and the number of erectors can be reduced." A rolling mechanisms briefly described in the Abstract (but possibly described in detail in the full patent), is used to assembly the components of the big screen. So this is a one time assembly, presumably, and hardly makes the suggestion of making the screens in Lebby form a continuous display. Actually, we do not even know for sure from the Abstract of the Japanese patent that a continuous display is produced. For example, in the Effect of the Invention, there is mention of "a multiscreen display", which really does not tell us anything in particular about what kind of display is presented, only that there are multi screens. The Examiner is taking a big leap of faith in asserting that this reference has any relevance either to Lebby or the present invention.

Koenig  
09/823,300

7

There has to be some sort of motivation for combining references, and in the present case, this can only come from the present disclosure.

Claim 7 has been replaced by a new claim 36 in which it is clearly recited that the second screen is nested under the first screen slides on tracks mounted on the lower and upper edges of the first screen to form a continuous screen with the first screen for a full width of an SVGA display. There is no reference which teaches the idea of retractable multiple screens which form a continuous display when deployed. As pointed out above, there is no such teaching in Lebby and the Japanese patent only mentions a "multiscreen" display leaving in the dark what that means. It is well established that foreign references are only good references for what they clearly teach, and there is no clear relevant teaching in this Japanese reference.

A number of other claims have been canceled. Claims 26-28 add the feature of two screens nested under the first screen, features not found or suggested anywhere in the art of record, and in claim 28 reciting the location of the tracks for the second and third screens and the full width of an SVGA display formed by all three screens. In addition, claim 28 has been amended to recite means for deploying the screens with the use of one hand of a user. Support for this is in pars. 0027 and 0028 of the publication of this application and Fig. 3.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the claims in their present form clearly distinguish over the art of record and should be allowed.

7

Koenig  
09/823,300


8

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned in the event that more changes are required in order to obtain allowance of the application.

A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Dated: June 23 , 2006

  
Alfred M. Walker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 29,983  
225 Old Country Road  
Melville, NY 11747-2712

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO (571) 273-8300 on the date indicated below.

June 23, 2006

  
Alfred M. Walker